







## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.ispio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
08/931,125	09/16/1997	HAE-SEUNG LEE	P54508	3842
75	90 06/04/2002			
ROBERT E BUSHNELL			EXAMINER	
1522 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 200051202			PORTKA, GARY J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2187	
			DATE MAILED: 06/04/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.





W

**Advisory Action** 

Application No. 08/931,125

Applicant(s)

Lee

Examiner

Gary J. Portka

Art Unit 2187



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
There reject allow:	REPLY FILED <u>May 28, 2002</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. fore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final ion under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for ance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.
	THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]
a)	The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b)	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
ex ap se	tensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate tension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The propriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally tin the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the silling date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
1. 🗆	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. 🗆	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a)	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b)	☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c)	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d)	they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE:
3. 🗆	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
3. 🗆	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
3.□	
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) □ affidavit, b) □ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  It is believed that all arguments have been sufficiently responded to previously. It is maintained that Fig. 2D and
4. 🗆	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) □ affidavit, b) □ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
4. 🗆	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) □ affidavit, b) □ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  It is believed that all arguments have been sufficiently responded to previously. It is maintained that Fig. 2D and
4. □ 5. ⊠	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) □ affidavit, b) □ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  It is believed that all arguments have been sufficiently responded to previously. It is maintained that Fig. 2D and associated description of Jones teaches one-to-one caching as claimed.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) □ affidavit, b) □ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  It is believed that all arguments have been sufficiently responded to previously. It is maintained that Fig. 2D and associated description of Jones teaches one-to-one caching as claimed.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) □ will not be entered or b) □ will be entered and an
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) \( \mathbb{X} \) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  It is believed that all arguments have been sufficiently responded to previously. It is maintained that Fig. 2D and associated description of Jones teaches one-to-one caching as claimed.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) \overline{\text{X}} request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  It is believed that all arguments have been sufficiently responded to previously. It is maintained that Fig. 2D and associated description of Jones teaches one-to-one caching as claimed.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □	Newly proposed or amended claim(s)
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □	Newly proposed or amended claim(s)
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □	Newly proposed or amended claim(s)
4. □ 5. ☒ 6. □ 7. □	Newly proposed or amended claim(s)